



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,686	12/17/2003	Xinwu Chen	03593.002543.	4140

5514 7590 05/05/2009  
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

NEWMAN, MICHAEL A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/05/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/736,686

**Applicant(s)**

CHEN ET AL.

**Examiner**

MICHAEL A. NEWMAN

**Art Unit**

2624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MICHAEL A. NEWMAN.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Brian L. Klock (Reg. No. 36,570).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 30 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,921).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's Representative provided a brief summary of the invention and the differences in the cited prior art. Proposed claim amendments to claim 1, to clarify such differences and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101, were discussed. Applicant's Representative was advised that further search and consideration would be required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Matthew C Bella/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624